CORD COMMUNICATIONS
tools for contextual learning

Feb. 21, 2011

RE: Response to Instruction; Title III; Title I, C; OIS and Textbook Adoption

Dear Members of the Indiana DOE and SBOE,

CORD Communications submits this letter and attached rebuttal document as a formal notice of dispute of reviewer rankings of our CORD mathematics textbooks. Having reviewed the scoring process, reviewer comments and Dana Center evaluations of *CORD Geometry: Learning in Context*, CORD Communications respectfully submits the request to have this textbook adopted and added to the state of Indiana's "Satisfactory" list. The facts presented in the attached rebuttal show the book not only meets the standards implemented by the state of Indiana, but also meets the needs of the teachers who would ultimately be charged with implementing the classroom instruction of the material.

We also request that the attached rebuttal be displayed in the comments section on the Indiana SBOE website, alongside the reviews of our textbooks. Thank you for time and consideration with this matter.

Yours Sincerely,

Piers Bateman
President and COO

601 Lake Air Dr. / Waco, Texas 76710 / (254) 776-1822 / (800) 231-3015 / Fax (254) 776-3906
www.cordcommunications.com

CORD Communications

Response to Instruction; Title III; Title I, C; OIS and Textbook Adoption

CORD Geometry: Learning In Context

Having reviewed the scoring process, reviewer comments and Dana Center evaluations of *CORD Geometry: Learning in Context*, CORD Communications respectfully submits the request to have this textbook adopted and added to the state of Indiana's "Satisfactory" list. The facts presented herein show the book not only meets the standards implemented by the state of Indiana, but also meets the needs of the teachers who would ultimately be charged with implementing the classroom instruction of the material.

- **Textbook Reviewer Evaluations**

Across the board, the overall scores for CORD Geometry were moderate and strong. Reviewers seemed to provide very positive feedback to CORD's contextual approach to teaching geometry. Positive responses include:

> ***"Good mix of defining, hands-on, and connecting to real world"***
>
> ***"Good connections in math labs."***

Reviewers also liked the fact that there is use of Geometer Sketchpad in numerous labs throughout the text. Combined with the recently completed Common Core Standard Supplement that will also accompany the textbook, CORD Geometry adequately meets state standards.

- **Dana Center Review**

The Dana Center reviews seem to be in stark contrast to the comments made by individual teacher textbook reviewers. Throughout the Dana Center reviews, there is a presumption of how an end-user/teacher will or will not conduct their classes if using CORD Geometry. Without exception, the chief negatives levied by the Dana Center are based on "might," "could," "if," and "depends," type arguments. Simply put, the Dana Center is concerned a teacher "might" omit a certain section of the lesson, a teacher "could" decide not to have the students interact with each other on a certain topic, etc. These are the types of arguments that could be levied against ANY textbook.

It appears the Dana Center's chief complaints are based on content layout and placement within the chapters or lessons. Rarely is the case made that the material is lacking. In the ***Summary of Evidence, Section 2: Reason abstractly and quantitatively***, there is concern that application problems ingrained in the unit are limited. However, in the very next sentence, the review states: *"An entire application section is included at the end of each chapter, resulting in possible omission. If the teacher incorporates the applications problems within each lesson, rather than leaving the problems until the end of the chapter, then the possibility for meeting this Core Standard increases."* This statement proves that the concern expressed is based solely on semantics, not content. The material is strong in meeting state standards, the Dana Center merely disagrees with some aspects of delivery. As with any textbook, delivery is the teacher's choice.

This pattern of criticism repeats itself in Sections 3, 4, 7, and 8 where chief complaints are again relegated to, "Opportunities will rely on teacher facilitation of the activities." Again, the actual content is not the issue as standards are met by incorporating the Math Labs, Math Applications, Think and Discuss and "critical thinking" sections of each lesson. Within the teacher's textbook and the lesson plans CD-ROM ancillary provided with the material, teachers are given a schedule of when and how to implement these labs into the classroom setting. In fact, the labs are an integral part of the learning and comprehension process. The math labs and applications are not considered an "additional learning" tool to supplement the lessons, but are an actual part of the chapter and lessons.

When specific criticisms are levied against the material, the Dana Center review contradicts itself. In ***Section 5: Use appropriate tools strategically***, the negative here is limited reference to the use of graphing calculators. In the same section, the Dana Center states "geometric constructions are presented as a separate section," and "there is at least one lab for each chapter which incorporates the opportunity to use a Geometry computer program. Overall, technology use is inherent in the Math Labs." Again, the argument is not based on content, but delivery. Specifically, CORD Geometry incorporates usage of graphing calculators, Geometer's Sketchpad, Cabri and Cabri, Jr. programs.

In Section 7, there is concern over limited connection to prior learning. CORD Communications believes there are ample opportunities to utilize prior learning. Ingrained in EACH lesson assessment are Mixed Review sections that incorporate prior learning of material. Combined

with Practice and Problem Solving sections, we feel students are continually revisiting and strengthening knowledge previously gained throughout the learning process.

Ultimately the teacher will always play the pivotal role in any textbook's success. Arguments based solely on what a teacher "might," or "could," do or "if this happens," are not justification for omitting CORD Geometry from Indiana's list of approved textbook. Based upon comments made by Indiana textbook reviewers, some of the very teachers who would be in control of using this textbook, CORD Geometry meets their needs.

Therefore, CORD Communications believes the schools ought to have the option of choosing *CORD Geometry: Learning in Context*.